

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the bound volumes of NLRB decisions. Readers are requested to notify the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, Washington, D.C. 20570, of any typographical or other formal errors so that corrections can be included in the bound volumes.

**Mi Pueblo Foods and International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 853, a/w Change to Win. Case 32-CA-25518**

March 4, 2011

**DECISION AND ORDER**

BY CHAIRMAN LIEBMAN AND MEMBERS BECKER  
AND HAYES

This is a refusal-to-bargain case in which the Respondent is contesting the Union's certification as bargaining representative in the underlying representation proceeding. Pursuant to a charge filed on December 14, 2010, the Acting General Counsel issued the complaint on December 29, 2010, alleging that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act by refusing the Union's request to bargain following the Union's certification in Case 32-RC-5794. (Official notice is taken of the "record" in the representation proceeding as defined in the Board's Rules and Regulations, Secs. 102.68 and 102.69(g); *Frontier Hotel*, 265 NLRB 343 (1982).) The Respondent filed an answer admitting in part and denying in part the allegations in the complaint.

On January 12, 2011, the Acting General Counsel filed a Motion for Summary Judgment. On February 3, 2011, the Board issued an order transferring the proceeding to the Board and a Notice to Show Cause why the motion should not be granted. The Respondent filed a response.

The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

**Ruling on Motion for Summary Judgment**

The Respondent admits its refusal to bargain, but contests the validity of the Union's certification on the basis that the unit is inappropriate.

All representation issues raised by the Respondent were or could have been litigated in the prior representation proceeding. The Respondent does not offer to adduce at a hearing any newly discovered and previously unavailable evidence, nor does it allege any special circumstances that would require the Board to reexamine the decision made in the representation proceeding. We therefore find that the Respondent has not raised any representation issue that is properly litigable in this unfair labor practice proceeding. See *Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. v. NLRB*, 313 U.S. 146, 162 (1941).

Accordingly, we grant the Motion for Summary Judgment.<sup>1</sup>

On the entire record, the Board makes the following

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

**I. JURISDICTION**

At all material times, the Respondent, a California corporation with an office and place of business in San Jose, California, has been engaged in the operation of retail grocery markets throughout Northern California and the San Francisco Bay Area.

During the 12-month period preceding issuance of the complaint, the Respondent, in the course and conduct of its business operations, derived gross revenues in excess of \$500,000 and purchased and received goods valued in excess of \$5000 directly from suppliers located outside the State of California.

We find that the Respondent is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6), and (7) of the Act, and that the Union, International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 853, a/w Change to Win, is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

**II. ALLEGED UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES**

**A. The Certification**

Following a representation election conducted on December 1, 2010, the Union was certified on December 9, 2010, as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit:

All full-time and regular part-time transport drivers employed by Respondent at its Milpitas, California facility; excluding all other employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

The Union continues to be the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the unit employees under Section 9(a) of the Act.

**B. Refusal to Bargain**

On about December 10, 2010, the Union, by letter, requested that the Respondent recognize and bargain with it as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the unit. Since December 16, 2010, the Respondent has declined to recognize or bargain with the Union. We find this failure and refusal constitutes an unlawful failure and refusal to recognize and bargain with the Union in violation of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act.

<sup>1</sup> The Respondent's request that the complaint be dismissed is therefore denied.

## CONCLUSION OF LAW

By failing and refusing since December 16, 2010, to recognize and bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the unit, the Respondent has engaged in unfair labor practices affecting commerce within the meaning of Section 8(a)(5) and (1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

## REMEDY

Having found that the Respondent has violated Section 8(a)(5) and (1) of the Act, we shall order it to cease and desist, to bargain on request with the Union and, if an understanding is reached, to embody the understanding in a signed agreement.

To ensure that the employees are accorded the services of their selected bargaining agent for the period provided by law, we shall construe the initial period of the certification as beginning the date the Respondent begins to bargain in good faith with the Union. *Mar-Jac Poultry Co.*, 136 NLRB 785 (1962); *Lamar Hotel*, 140 NLRB 226, 229 (1962), *enfd.* 328 F.2d 600 (5th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied* 379 U.S. 817 (1964); and *Burnett Construction Co.*, 149 NLRB 1419, 1421 (1964), *enfd.* 350 F.2d 57 (10th Cir. 1965).

ORDER<sup>2</sup>

The National Labor Relations Board orders that the Respondent, Mi Pueblo Foods, Milpitas, California, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall

## 1. Cease and desist from

(a) Failing and refusing to recognize and bargain with International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local 853, a/w Change to Win as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

(b) In any like or related manner interfering with, restraining, or coercing employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed them by Section 7 of the Act.

## 2. Take the following affirmative action necessary to effectuate the policies of the Act.

(a) On request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment and, if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All full-time and regular part-time transport drivers employed by Respondent at its Milpitas, California facility; excluding all other employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

(b) Within 14 days after service by the Region, post at its facility in San Jose, California, copies of the attached notice marked "Appendix."<sup>3</sup> Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 32, after being signed by the Respondent's authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondent and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. In addition to physical posting of paper notices, notices shall be distributed electronically, such as by email, posting on an intranet or an internet site, and/or other electronic means, if the Respondent customarily communicates with its employees by such means. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event that, during the pendency of these proceedings, the Respondent has gone out of business or closed the facility involved in these proceedings, the Respondent shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondent at any time since December 16, 2010.

(c) Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. March 4, 2011

---

Wilma B. Liebman, Chairman

---

Craig Becker, Member

---

Brian E. Hayes, Member

(SEAL) NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with our recently issued decision in *J. Picini Flooring*, 356 NLRB No. 9 (2010), we have ordered the Respondent to distribute the notice electronically if it is customarily communicating with employees by such means. For the reasons stated in his dissenting opinion in *J. Picini Flooring*, Member Hayes would not require electronic distribution of the notice.

<sup>3</sup> If this Order is enforced by a judgment of a United States court of appeals, the words in the notice reading "Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board" shall read "Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board."

## APPENDIX

## NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

## POSTED BY ORDER OF THE

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

## An Agency of the United States Government

The National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated Federal labor law and has ordered us to post and obey this notice.

## FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO

Form, join, or assist a union

Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf

Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection

Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities.

WE WILL NOT fail and refuse to recognize and bargain with the International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local

853, a/w Change to Win, as the exclusive collective-bargaining representative of the employees in the bargaining unit.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner interfere with, restrain, or coerce you in the exercise of the rights guaranteed you by Section 7 of the Act.

WE WILL, on request, bargain with the Union as the exclusive representative of the employees in the following appropriate unit on terms and conditions of employment, and, if an understanding is reached, embody the understanding in a signed agreement:

All full-time and regular part-time transport drivers employed by us at our Milpitas, California facility; excluding all other employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

MI PUEBLO FOODS